

## **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for allowing claims 11-14 and 23-25. Some errors have been found in the reference numbers of Figures 1 and 2, and corrections have been made. Claims 1-3 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shin et. al. (U.S. Patent 6,169,580). Claims 1-2 and 15-16 have been canceled. The method of Shin according to claim 1 of Shin includes “a first step for setting and storing time difference adjusting data”. The Applicant’s application and Shin describe totally different methods for at least this reason, among other things.

The Office Action (OA) alleges claim 3 is met by Shin as being inherent to Shin. However, claim 3 states “wherein the clock is updated only when the comparison indicates that a station identified by the channel identification data is in the same time zone as the electronic equipment”. In contrast, Shin discloses always updating the system clock. For example, at col. 4, lines 26-29 Shin states “Thereafter, the timer 13 is controlled in Steps S5 and S6, so that the time of the current transmitting region is adjusted to the time of the receiving region and is displayed on the display unit 14.” Also, at col. 4, lines 48-50, Shin discloses “Thereafter, the time data of ‘5:00 am, Jan. 21, 1998’ is displayed on the display unit 14 as a current time by controlling the timer 13.” Nowhere within these cited portions or any other portions of Shin, as best as can be determined by the Applicants, does Shin teach or suggest only updating the clock when the comparison indicates that a station identified by the channel identification data is in the same time zone as the electronic equipment. Thus, for example, Shin allows the clock to be updated from a broadcast signal from a time zone other than the local time zone in which the electronic equipment is located. If the broadcast signal from the other than the local time zone is broadcasting an incorrect time, the clock is updated incorrectly, as the clock is always updated

according to Shin. For at least this reason, among other things, Applicants believe claim 3 is in condition for allowance, and respectfully request claim 3 be allowed as not being anticipated by Shin.

Regarding claims 4, 5, and 6, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also allowable due to additional novel and non-obvious subject matter provided by these claims, and because these claims depend either directly or indirectly on an allowable claim.

Claim 17 is the method claim corresponding to claim 3, and Applicants respectfully reassert the above relevant remarks for allowability of claim 3 for the allowability of claim 17. Regarding claims 18 and 19, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also allowable due to additional novel and non-obvious subject matter provided by these claims, and because these claims depend either directly or indirectly on an allowable claim. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 3 and 17 are not anticipated by Shin and are allowable over Shin, and should be allowed if re-written in independent form. Likewise, claims 4-6 and 18-19, that depend on claims 3 and 17 either directly or indirectly are respectfully asserted to not be anticipated by Shin and are allowable over Shin.

Claims 4-10 and 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin et. al. in view of Duffield et. al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,617,146). Shin discloses a method for automatically adjusting a time difference for a video instrument (see Abstract) and as described in claim 1 of Shin “a first step for setting and storing time difference adjusting data”. Shin describes an issue as “..., since the conventional automatic time setting apparatus sets the time based on the time data contained in the broadcasting signal without using the time difference between the region in which the broadcasting signal is transmitted and the region in which the broadcasting signal is received, the user may incorrectly set the time.” (see Shin at column 2,

lines 10-16) Shin describes a conventional method in which “a high frequency current time data is received from the broadcasting station and then is amplified and demodulated, thus converting the data into a digital signal. The thusly converted digital signal is decoded, and a time data is detected.” (see Shin at column 1, lines 49-56) However, Shin does not appear to disclose or suggest all of the system apparatus included in the amended claim 8, and in particular, does not disclose or suggest, among other things, at least the “capture engine” and the “vertical blanking interval decoder”, as soon will be argued.

Duffield discloses “a system for processing a television signal including a data component, such as extended data services data, includes a decoder for processing the data component to provide data representing time information.” (see Abstract) Duffield appears to address the issue “The time information decoded from the video signal is compared to the time information maintained in the system to determine a time difference. If the time difference is in a predetermined range, the time difference indicates that the time information from the television signal is invalid. The control device responds to the time difference being in the predetermined range by preventing modification of the time information maintained in the system.” (see Abstract) It appears Duffield addresses the issue of how to prevent updating time information maintained in the system when receiving non-current time, e.g. from a VCR signal as versus from a live broadcast. (see Duffield column 1, lines 41-60) Duffield also appears to lack describing all of the system elements of amended claim 8.

However, before addressing claim 8, with regard to claim 3 and the related method claim 17, the OA has rejected these claims as being unpatentable over Shin in view of Duffield. Applicants respectfully repeat the above remarks for claim 3 and 17 not being anticipated by Shin as Shin does not teach the claim 3 language “wherein the clock is updated only when the

comparison indicates that a station identified by the channel identification data is in the same time zone as the electronic equipment”. Moreover, as best as applicants can determine, no cited portions of Duffield or any other portions of Duffield describe or teach the claim language of claim 3. For at least these reasons, among other things, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 3 and 17 are patentable over Shin in view of Duffield. Likewise, with regard to claims 4-6 and 18-19, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also patentable over Shin in view of Duffield due to additional novel and non-obvious subject matter provided by these claims, and because these claims depend either directly or indirectly on allowable claims that are patentable over Shin in view of Duffield.

Claim 8 claims “a capture engine” and a “vertical blanking interval decoder”. The Office Action (OA) alleges that Shin in view of Duffield suggests these claimed elements. For example, the OA cites portions of Shin at col. 1, lines 49-56, and at col. 3, line 56 – col.4, line 50, regarding the alleged assertion, however these cited portions do not describe or suggest “a capture engine” and a “vertical blanking interval decoder”. Instead, these cited portions describe “converting the data into a digital signal. The thusly converted digital signal is decoded, and a time data is detected” (col. 1, lines 49-56) and “The decoder 16 detects the broadcasting station ID and the time data from the selected broadcasting signals. ... Therefore, the microcomputer 15 receives the broadcasting station ID and time data from the decoder 16 and ...” (col. 4, lines 13-24). Regarding Shin in view of Duffield, for example, Duffield is cited at col. 1, lines 13-23 in support of allegedly suggesting the claim language “a capture engine” and a “vertical blanking interval decoder”. However, this cited portion does not appear to teach or suggest this claim language. In contrast, the cited portion of Duffield describes “...EDS offers a wide range of useful information such as: program title, network name, and current time of day.” The cited

portion also discloses “EDS information will be available on line 21 of field 2”, which appears to be part of the vertical blanking interval information, but no mention is made or suggested regarding “a capture engine” and a “vertical blanking interval decoder”. In fact, as best as can be determined, no portions of Shin or Duffield alone or in combination suggest the “capture engine” and “vertical blanking interval decoder” as claimed in claim 8.

Claim 8 also claims “an update module operatively coupled to the extraction module and the validation module, the update module updating the interval clock in the computer when a current value of the time stamp information of the display data differs from a current value of the interval clock in the computer and when the comparison indicates that a station identified by the channel identification information is in the same time zone as the computer”. The OA alleges that Shin teaches or suggests this claim language. For example, Shin is cited at col. 4, lines 20-29, e.g. “Thereafter, the timer 13 is controlled in steps S5 and S6, so that the time of the current transmitting region is adjusted to the time of the receiving region and is displayed on the display unit 14”. However, the limitations of the claim language “an update module operatively coupled to the extraction module and the validation module, the update module updating the interval clock in the computer when a current value of the time stamp information of the display data differs from a current value of the interval clock in the computer and when the comparison indicates that a station identified by the channel identification information is in the same time zone as the computer” are missing in this portion and other portions cited in Shin. Rather, Shin appears to unconditionally and always update and display “an adjusted time” of the time retrieved from the broadcasting channel. Shin does not indicate a conditional update of the clock based on receiving the time stamp in a broadcast signal from a same time zone as the computer is located in or based on a difference in the time stamp time and the time in the computer clock, as

claim 8 claims. Applicants also respectfully reassert the relevant remarks above regarding claims 3 and 17.

Claim 8 has been amended to resolve antecedent issues, and to add claim language regarding “a capture engine operatively coupled to the video decoder, the capture engine converting the digital television signal to display data”. The addition of this claim language is supported in the detailed description of the application on page 5, in the first paragraph describing FIG. 1, lines 6-9. The change in the claim language to add the limitation “an update module operatively coupled to the extraction module and the validation module, ...” is supported in the same aforementioned paragraph of the application on page 6, lines 6-10. No new matter has been added. For at least the above reasons, among other things, Applicants respectfully assert amended claim 8 is in condition for allowance and respectfully request that claim 8 be allowed.

Regarding claims 9 and 10 which depend on claim 8, claims 9 and 10 have been amended in a minor fashion to correct for antecedent issues. Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also in condition for allowance due to additional novel and non-obvious subject matter provided by these claims, and because these claims depend either directly or indirectly on base claim 8.

As noted in the OA, claims 11-14 have been allowed. Applicants cancel Claims 15-16. Claims 17-19 have been argued above. Claims 20-22 have been amended to correspond to the amendments of claims 8-10, claim 20 being the method claim corresponding to the system claim 8, and claims 21-22 are dependent on claim 20. Applicants respectfully request claim 20 be allowed for the same reasons provided above for allowing claim 8. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 21-22 are also allowable due to additional novel and non-obvious subject

matter provided by these claims, and because these claims depend either directly or indirectly on base claim 20.

Claims 23-25 have been allowed.

Claims 26-29 are canceled and replaced by claims 30-31. Claim 30 is an independent system claim that rewrites claim 26 to include the subject matter of dependent claims 27-28. Claim 31 corresponds to claim 29, but is dependent on claim 30.

The claims 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin in view of Dinwiddie et. al. (U.S. Patent 6, 433, 831). Since claims 30-31 are just a rewrite of claims 26-29, Applicants assume the reasons set forth by the office for rejection of claims 26-29 would be applied to the new claims 30-31.

As described in the last paragraph of the Background section of Dinwiddie, Dinwiddie describes the “need in the art for a method and apparatus that permit a user to selectively set the clock on their television receiver to adjust for time differences between the multi-formatted sources of television signals, without interfering with the temporal time transmitted by one of the multi-formatted television signals.”

The OA alleges for claim 26 (and thus for the rewritten claim 30) that the claimed “update module operatively coupled to the extraction module, the update module updating the interval clock in the computer when a current time value of the information data differs from a current value of the interval clock in the computer...” is met by Shin, for example, as disclosed in FIGs. 1,2 items 15, 13, 17, col. 1 lines 8-28, col. 4 lines 13-50. Applicants respectfully wish to reassert the relevant remarks made above for allowance of claim 8 for the allowability of claim 30. Moreover, amended claim 30 also states “the interval clock is updated only when the comparison indicates that a station identified by the channel identification data is in the same

time zone as the computer.” Nowhere in the cited portions of Shin does it state or suggest that an update module updates the interval clock only when a current time value of the information data differs from a current value of the interval clock and the comparison indicates that a station identified by the channel identification data is in the same time zone as the computer, as claimed in amended claim 30. The Applicants respectfully reassert the relevant remarks made above regarding claims 3 and 17. Rather, the cited portion at col. 1, lines 8-28, states “...and a microcomputer 15 for detecting the output signal from the input unit 12 and adjusting the time of the timer 13 in accordance with a time data inputted from the time data detector 11.” The cited portion at col. 4, lines 13-50, in particular at lines 26-29, states “Thereafter, the timer 13 is controlled in steps S5 and S6, so that the time of the current transmitting region is adjusted to the time of the receiving region and is displayed on the display unit 14.” Nowhere within these cited portions, or any other portions of Shin as best as can be determined, does Shin teach or suggest the claimed language of amended claim 30. Dinwiddie also does not teach or suggest the claim language of amended claim 30 recited above. For at least the above reasons, among other things, Applicants respectfully assert claim 30 to be in condition for allowance, and respectfully request allowance of claim 30.

Claim 31 is dependent on claim 30. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 31 is also allowable due to additional novel and non-obvious subject matter provided by this claim, and because this claim depends on base claim 30.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims 8-10, 20-22, and 30-31 as now amended are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this Application.



Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 1, 2005

By: Donald L. Andruska  
Donald L. Andruska  
Reg. No. 55,798

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.  
222 North LaSalle Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
Telephone: (312) 609-7831  
Facsimile: (312) 609-5005  
E-mail: dandruska@vedderprice.com

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheets of replacement drawings include changes to FIGs. 1 and 2. The attached sheets for FIGs. 1 and 2 replace the original sheets and correct for incorrect reference numbers. In FIG. 1 the CAPTURE ENGINE is renumbered from 102 to 106. In FIG. 2 the CAPTURE ENGINE is renumbered from 202 to 206. No new matter has been added.

Attachment: 2 Replacement Sheets